

REMARKS

Upon entry of this amendment, claims 1-5 and 7-12 are all the claims pending in the application. In this regard, it is noted that claim 6 has been canceled by this amendment, and the features recited therein have been substantially incorporated into independent claims 1 and 10.

Regarding the Information Disclosure Statement (IDS) filed on July 17, 2008, it is noted that the Examiner has indicated that JP 2001-202281 has not been considered because a concise explanation of the relevance of this reference was not provided. Applicant respectfully disagrees. In particular, Applicant notes that in item 4e on page 3 of the above-noted IDS, a concise explanation is provided for the JP 2001-202281 reference, in which it is indicated that JP 2001-202281 corresponds to US 2001/0032326. Accordingly, because a concise explanation of relevance was provided for the above-noted reference, it is kindly requested that the Examiner return a new copy of the PTO-1449 form indicating that the JP 2001-202281 reference has been considered.

I. Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-3 and 6 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Ellis et al. (U.S. 6,029,226).

As noted above, claim 6 has been canceled by this amendment, and the features recited therein have been substantially incorporated into claim 1. In particular, Applicant notes that claim 1 now recites that that a wait flag is appended to a command received from the host device, and if the command with the wait flag is received and a following command has yet to be received, the analysis unit waits for the following command to be received.

Regarding the above-noted features, Applicant notes that in the Office Action, the Examiner has taken the position that Ellis discloses such features at col. 5, lines 54-58 (see Office Action at page 5). Applicant respectfully disagrees.

In particular, with respect to Ellis, Applicant notes that this reference discloses the use of a DMA engine 362 that includes active context registers 400 and inactive context registers 402, wherein information in a context frame 404 is stored in the active context registers 400 and the inactive context registers 402 (see Figs. 3 and 4; and col. 5, lines 9-13). Regarding the information in the context frame 404, it is noted that Fig. 4 of Ellis depicts such information, with "DMA status field" being one of the pieces of information stored therein (see Fig. 4 and col. 5, line 54).

With respect to the "DMA status field", Ellis explains that this field is employed to set alerts or initiate the sending of messages upon various actions, with an example of such an action being the pausing of a data access due to availability of the data (see col. 5, lines 54-56). In addition, Ellis describes that the "DMA status field" is used to indicate that a DMA transfer has been finished or aborted (see col. 5, lines 56-57).

Thus, as is evident from the above-noted description, while the "DMA status field" of Ellis can be used to initiate the sending of messages if a DMA transfer is in a paused state due to data unavailability, Applicant notes that such messages are merely used to indicate that data is not ready for a disk access and that the DMA transfer is in a paused state. In other words, the "DMA status field" is merely used as a status signal indicating the execution result of a DMA transfer, for example, that data access for a coalesced write is currently paused.

Based on the foregoing, Applicants note that while the "DMA status field" is used to indicate the status of a DMA transfer (e.g., paused state, finished, or aborted), that such information does not correspond to the "wait flag" of claim 1, which is indicated as being appended to a command received from the host device, wherein if the command with the wait flag is received and a following command has yet to be received, the analysis unit waits for the following command to be received.

In other words, according to claim 1, the wait flag is appended to a command, and indicates that the analysis unit should wait for a following command to be received. In contrast, as explained above, the "DMA status field" of Ellis is merely information that is used to indicate the current status of a DMA transfer (e.g., paused state, finished, or aborted).

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that Ellis does not disclose, suggest or otherwise render obvious the above-noted features recited in amended claim 1 which indicates that a wait flag is appended to a command received from the host device, and if the command with the wait flag is received and a following command has yet to be received, the analysis unit waits for the following command to be received.

Accordingly, Applicants submit that claim 1 is patentable over Ellis, an indication of which is kindly requested. Regarding claims 2 and 3, Applicant notes that these claims depend from claim 1 and are therefore considered patentable at least by virtue of their dependency.

II. Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

A. Claims 4 and 5 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable

over Ellis et al. (U.S. 6,029,226) in view of Ellis et al. (U.S. 7,181,548).

Claims 4 and 5 depend from claim 1. Applicant submits that Ellis ('548) fails to cure the deficiencies of Ellis ('226), as discussed above, with respect to claim 1. Accordingly, Applicant submits that claims 4 and 5 are patentable at least by virtue of their dependency.

B. Claims 7 and 8 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ellis et al. (U.S. 6,029,226) in view of Krantz (U.S. 6,826,650).

Claims 7 and 8 depend from claim 1. Applicant submits that Krantz fails to cure the deficiencies of Ellis, as discussed above, with respect to claim 1. Accordingly, Applicant submits that claims 7 and 8 are patentable at least by virtue of their dependency.

C. Claim 9 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ellis et al. (U.S. 6,029,226) in view of Harari et al. (U.S. 5,297,148).

Claim 9 depend from claim 1. Applicant submits that Harari fails to cure the deficiencies of Ellis, as discussed above, with respect to claim 1. Accordingly, Applicant submits that claim 9 is patentable at least by virtue of its dependency.

D. Claims 10-12 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ellis et al. (U.S. 6,029,226) in view of Carman et al. (U.S. 6,272,632).

Regarding claim 10, Applicant notes that this claim has been amended to recite that a wait flag is appended to a command received from the host device, and if the command with the

wait flag is received and a following command has yet to be received, the analysis unit waits for the following command.

For at least similar reasons as discussed above with respect to claim 1, Applicant respectfully submits that Ellis does not disclose, suggest or otherwise render obvious the above-noted features recited in claim 10. Further, Applicant submits that Carman does not cure these deficiencies of Ellis.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant submits that claim 10 is patentable over the cited prior art, an indication of which is kindly requested. Claims 11 and 12 depend from claim 10 and are therefore considered patentable at least by virtue of their dependency.

III. Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited.

If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may best be resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

Takeshi OHTSUKA

By: Kenneth W. Fields
Kenneth W. Fields
Registration No. 52,430
Attorney for Applicant

KWF/krq
Washington, D.C. 20006-1021
Telephone (202) 721-8200
Facsimile (202) 721-8250
November 12, 2008